



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, DC 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09 730,750	12 07 2000	Osamu Hashimoto	50090-247	9440

7590 10 21 2002

McDermott, Will & Emery
600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, JIMMY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2829

DATE MAILED: 10 21 2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/730,750

Applicant(s)

HASHIMOTO ET AL.

Examiner

Jimmy Nguyen

Art Unit

2829

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on amendment filed 6/27/02.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-6 and 8 - 12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) 8 - 12 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 7
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Argument

The applicant argues that there is no motivation to combine Tada and Chiba. The examiner disagrees.

In the present case, our factual finding is that providing the exchange board and spacer interposed within the within the test system is well known in the art. Hingedly affixing the exchange board and spacer interposed of Chiba to the socket mounted device is to ensure the wiring pattern connected from the socket pins to the relay socket and therefore accomplish the proper performance of the system will meet every element and aspect recited in claim 1. Thus, the examiner's rejection was based on a ratiocinative application of the prior art, and was not "without motivation"

As explained in detail above, the amendments do not render the claims distinct and patentable over prior art; nor do the amendments overcome the rejection. The applicant's arguments have considered in full, but they are deemed to be unpersuasive. Therefore, this final rejection is made.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2829

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tada et al (US 4801871) in view of Chiba (US 6100585).

Regarding claim 1, Tada et al discloses (fig 5 and 6) an inspection apparatus for inspecting a plurality of semiconductor IC mounted on a base board including

A plurality of relay pins (R1, R 2) electrically connected to a wiring pattern laid on the base board (4)

Sockets (2) provided on the base board (4), each housing a semiconductor IC (1). However; Tada et al is silent on the

Exchange boards, each electrically connecting socket terminals of a socket to a specific relay pins and spacers interposed between each of the exchange boards and the base board. On the other hand, Chiba (FIG 2) teach

Exchange boards (15), each electrically connecting socket terminals (15a) of a socket to a specific relay pins (16a) and spacers interposed (16a) between each of the exchange boards (15) and the base board (13)

The relays pin 16a performs as the interposed spacer and relays pin itself

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide the exchange board and spacer interposed within the socket mounted device for the purpose of ensuring the wiring pattern connected to socket pins to be lead onto the relay socket in its externally exposed area.

Regarding claim 3, Chiba teach the exchange board (15) is provided with a pin socket (15a) for holding the relay pins (16a) and the relay pins are removably attached to the exchange board (15)

Regarding claim 4, Chiba teach the base board (13) has a pin socket (15a) for holding the relay pins (16a), and the exchange board (15) is removable from the base board (13) together with relay pins (16a)

Regarding claims 5, 6, Tada et al discloses (fig 1) a circuit element or a pattern for receiving a circuit element is formed in an area on the base board (40), the area opposing the exchange board

Regarding claim 2, The examiner takes official note that the exchange board is a film like sheet board, and a reinforcement plate for reinforcing the sheet like board is provided between the sheet like board and the spacers would have been an obvious choice within the Chia reference because the exchange board is a film will ensure the durable and provide better reinforcement for dut during testing.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 8 – 12 are allowed.

The prior art of record fail to disclose a junction unit for changing the state of a junction formed between the connection terminals and the wiring pattern wherein the junction unit includes a group of pin sockets each of which is interposed between each of plurality of wiring patterns and a single connection terminal and/or a group of pin sockets

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Application/Control Number: 09/730,750
Art Unit: 2829

Page 6

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jimmy Nguyen at (703) 306-5858. Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4900.

JN.
Oct 15, 2002



KAMAND CUNEO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800